

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS:

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. All claims have been rejected. In particular, claims 1-3, 8, 12, 18, 22-23 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheffler (U.S. Patent No. 6,522,261). Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10, 17-20, 23, 27, 28, 30 and 31 have been amended as indicated hereinabove. New Claims 32-33 have been added, while claims 7, 11, 22 and 26 have been canceled.

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that original claims 6, 7, 9, 11, 17, 19-20 and 26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. The table below indicates how the claims have been amended to incorporate their base and intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-21, 23-27 and new claims 32-33 should be allowable.

<i>Current claim</i>	<i>Incorporates original claims</i>
1	1 and 7
2	1, 2 and 7
3	1, 2, 3 and 7
4	1, 2, 4 and 7
5	1, 2, 4, 5 and 7
6	1, 2 and 6
8	1, 7 and 8
9	9
10	10 and 11
12	10, 11 and 12
13	10, 11, 12 and 13
14	10, 11, 12, 13 and 14
15	10, 11 and 15
16	10, 11 and 16
17	10, 16 and 17
18	10, 11 and 18
19	10 and 19
20	10 and 20
21	10, 11 and 21
23	23 and 26
24	23, 24 and 26
25	23, 24, 25 and 26
27	23 and 27
28	28
29	28 and 29
30	n/a
31	n/a
32	1, 2, 3 and 6
33	1, 2, 6 and 8

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-5, 9, 24-25 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that the limitation “escutcheon” is unclear and confusing in nature, and has suggested that the term be changed to “transparent cover” or “lens”.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this reading. As the dictionary cited by the Examiner states, an escutcheon is a shield or a protective plate. Fig. 2 clearly shows the escutcheon (20) which fits over a transparent housing. See the Specification as filed, page 5, lines 6-7. Thus the escutcheon, or removable cover, is an ornamental protective plate that covers the strobe unit (except for the lens). The limitation is thus not unclear or confusing, and Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner further states that, while the limitation “dimple” is defined as a concave structure, the drawing portrays a convex structure, and suggests amending the word “dimple” to read “convex lens”.

Again, Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation. The dimple (34) shown in Fig. 2 is simply a concave indentation in the surface of the escutcheon (20) that allows observation of the strobe intensity viewing slot (36). Without the dimple, the escutcheon itself would block the intensity viewing slot. Thus the dimple is neither a lens nor a part of the lens. Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection. Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 24 and 25, although they have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), depend from allowable claims, should therefore also be allowable.

Claims 28-29, like claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 24 and 25 discussed above, also recite the “dimple” limitation, and have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheffler in view of Rinaldi (T103802). However, claim 28 being an independent claim, its allowance does not flow from another claim. Nonetheless, as Applicants have above clarified the nature of the “dimple,” it should be clear that neither Scheffler nor Rinaldi, taken in combination or separately, teach or suggest a dimple through which an intensity indication of the selected strobe intensity can be viewed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection in favor of

allowance of claim 28 (which has been amended only to correct a spelling error). Allowance of dependent claim 29 should follow.

With respect to claim 20, while the Examiner has indicated claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten to incorporate the limitations of the base and intervening claims, the Examiner has also indicated that the limitation “coded component” is unclear because it is unknown what “component” is being coded and it is unknown what is meant by “coded”.

Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to page 4, lines 1-3 of the Specification as filed, where it is suggested that a coded component can be, for example, a color-coded or marked resistor or other electronic or mechanical component. See also page 7, lines 26-31 of the Specification as filed. Applicants believe it would be reasonable that one of ordinary skill would understand that the selected strobe setting is “coded” by this component; for example a red component may indicate one setting while a blue component may indicate a different setting.

Thus, Applicants do not believe that the limitation “coded component” is unclear and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112 in favor of allowance, without the suggested amendment.

Claims 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheffler in view, respectively, of Gilbert (U.S. Patent No. 4,768,926) and Kutoba (U.S. Patent No. 5,335,153). Gilbert teaches a remote control fan. When the user selects a speed or direction with the remote control unit, an audible signal is sounded to indicate to the user which switch on the remote control has been activated. In other words, an audible tone provides instant audible feedback to a user upon selection of a setting. Kutoba teaches an indicator lighting unit for use in an automobile dashboard

Claim 30 has been amended to clarify that the strobe setting is pre-selected and to recite a selection indicator that actively identifies the selected intensity upon the occurrence of at least one of several events. Neither Scheffler, nor Gilbert, nor Kutoba,

taken in combination or separately, teach or suggest this feature. Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30 in favor of allowance.

Claim 31 has been amended to enumerate different forms that the active selection indicator of claim 30 may take, and now depends from claim 30. Allowance of claim 31 should follow from claim 30.

Support for the amendments of claims 30 and 31 may be found, for example, in the Specification as filed at page 6, line 26 to page 7, line 25.

Finally, it is noted that many of the claims have been amended to correct spelling errors, *i.e.*, to change “applicance” to “appliance”.

Similarly, the Specification has been amended to correct a spelling error.

Applicants are concurrently submitting a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement disclosing references of which they have recently become aware. While Applicants do not believe these references have any bearing on the patentability of the present invention, Applicants respectfully request consideration of this IDS by the Examiner.

Applicants make no admissions with respect to patentability of those original claims that have been amended and reserve the right to refile those claims in a continuation application.

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance; that is, that pending claims (claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-21, 23-25 and 27-33) are allowable. None of the amendments to the specification or the claims introduce new matter. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By Gerald M. Bluhm
Gerald M. Bluhm
Registration No.: 44,035
Tel.: 978-731-7244
Fax: 978-246-6336

Westminster, Massachusetts 01441-0001
Date: May 11, 2005